UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,448	06/02/2005	Rob A. Beuker	348162-982480	2666

94518   7590   01/19/2011
DLA PIPER LLP (US)
2000 UNIVERSITY AVENUE
EAST PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER
MA, CALVIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/19/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _04 November 2010_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Gindele et al. (USP 6549678) in view of Prentice (US Pub 2002/0159631).

As to claim 1, Gindele discloses a method for improving the perceived resolution

of a color matrix display (i.e. the computer display 30 shown in figure 1) with at least

one pixel, comprising the steps of

subdividing an incident color channel signal to said pixel into a first and second

signal component (i.e. the pedestial splitter 30a takes on the red channel and split it into

Rtxt and Rped signal) (see Fig. 2, Col. 3, Lines 45-67),

applying a gain factor to one of said signal components, (i.e. the slope calculator

37 applies the gains which is a scalar constant based on the color's texture

displacement in the overall image which is a function of there overall brightness

contribution since the color placement of the color channel are factored into the

calculated mid-tone gain (see Fig. 2, Col. 5, Lines 5-55), and

subsequently recombining said first and second signal components into an

exiting modified color channel signal (39) (i.e. the texture signal and the pedestal signal

are recombined at the adder which exit the system as transformed color image which

could be display on the computer screen) (see Fig. 1, 2, Col. 3, Lines 23-44).

However Gindele does not explicitly teach the gain factor being based upon the

incident color channel signal's contribution to total luminance of the display, Prentice

teaches the gain factor being based upon the incident color channel signal's contribution

to total luminance of the display (i.e. Prentice teaches a color specific gain factor control

based on the luminance channel which is the contribution of the overall luminance of the

display when extracted from the image data as a whole, in this way the filtering system

of Prentice is able to factor in the contribution for each of the color channel in term of

luminance when applying color specific filtering) (see Prentice, Fig. 2, 3, [0016-0018]).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have utilized the color specific luminance based gain

factor filtering image processing design of Prentice in the overall display system of

Gindele in order to allow the user better display result for outdoor photographic display

applications such as digital camera viewing (see Prentice [0022]).

As to claim 7, see claim 1 above, claim 7 differs from claim 1 only in that it is a

device claim rather than a method claim and is analyzed to have the same limiting

scope and is therefore rejected for the same reason (i.e. the computer display 30 is a

color matrix display device) (see Gindele, Fig. 1).

As to claim 12, see claims 1 and 7 above, claim 12 is analyzed to differ from claim 7 only in the additional limitation of "a plurality of pixels controlled by applied color channel signals" which is taught by Gindele in the form of the computer monitor 30 which has plurality of displaying pixels which are fed the color signal from the display processing unit of the computer 20 after being process by the image processing system. In this way claim 12 still read on the prior art Gindele.

As to claim 2, Gindele teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said first and second components are a low-pass component and a high-pass component, respectively (i.e. even though Gindele does not explicitly define the signal nature of the texture and the pedestal signals, it is shown that the texture signal is of high-pass signal type, since it relies on a high-pass filter for the main component which is modified by the avoidance signal circuitry 80, where a low pass filter in only applied for specific artifact avoidance which does not effect to overall nature of the signal in general, while the pedestal is said to be a smooth signal which results from the original signal subtracting the texture signal which by definition result in a low-pass signal of the original signal) (see Fig. 2, 3, Col. 4, Lines 10-55, Col. 6, Lines 1-43).

As to claim 3, see claim 2 above, Gindele teaches the first and second signal components are respectively a low-pass component and a high-pass components(see Fig. 2, 3, Col. 4, Lines 10-55, Col. 6, Lines 1-43), and

applying a gain factor to one of said signal components includes applying the

gain factor only to said high-pass component (i.e. the mid-tone gain factor scalar

component is only applied to the texture signal which is the high-pass component) (see

Fig. 3, Col. 4, Lines 10-55, Col. 6, Lines 1-43).

As to claim 4, Gindele teaches a method according to claim 2, wherein said low-

pass component is realized by means of a low-pass filter, and said high-pass

component is realized by means of a high-pass filter, said low-pass and high-pass filters

being complementary (i.e. since the texture signal is formed which a high-pass filter and

the pedestal signal is formed by having the original signal subtracting the texture signal,

the pedestal signal has the equivalent low pass filter applied on it since the subtraction

of the high-pass signal naturally result in the low pass signal, and in this when the to

filter are complementary) (see Fig. 2, 3, Col. 4, Lines 10-55, Col. 6, Lines 1-43).

As to claim 5, Gindele teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising

the step of:

determining the gain factor for the one of said signal components (i.e. the red

color channel applied to 30a) based upon the incident color channel signal's contribution

to total luminance of the display, the gain factor being inversely proportional to the

contribution of the color channel to the total luminance of the color matrix display (i.e.

the mid-tone modifier is inverse proportional to the overall brightness since the brighter

the color components is on color space the Euclidian distance is in inverse relationship

with its mid-tone) (see Col. 5, Lines 20-35).

As to claim 6, Gindele teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising

the step of:

transmitting said exiting, modified color channel signal to a delay and up or

downsampling block in order to provide the modified color channel signal with a suitable

delay and scaling (i.e. since Gindele teaches the computer system 20 being able to

display the image that is corrected on the display 30 the computer display control

system must create the needed delay and scaling to fit the image data into the video

buffer and thereby display it correctly on the screen 30) (see Fig. 1, Col. 3, Lines 5-35).

As to claim 8, Gindele teaches a color matrix display device as in claim 7,

wherein the control unit determines the gain factor based upon the incident color

channel signal's contribution to total luminance of the display (i.e. the slope calculator

37 applies the gains which is a scalar constant based on the color's texture

displacement in the overall image which is a function of there overall brightness

contribution since the color placement of the color channel are factored into the

calculated mid-tone gain (see Fig. 2, Col. 5, Lines 5-55).

As to claim 9, Gindele teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the step

of subdividing includes subdividing each of the separate color channel signals for an

image into a first and second signal component (i.e. as seen in figure 2 all three of the

red, green, and blue channels are subdivided).

As to claim 10, Gindele teaches a method according to claim 1,

wherein the step of subdividing includes subdividing each of the separate color

channel signals for an image into a first and second signal component (i.e. as seen in

figure 2 all three of the red, green, and blue channels are subdivided via 30a, 30b, and

30c), and

wherein applying a gain factor includes applying a separate gain factor to one of

the signal components of each separate color channel signal (i.e. the signals RGB are

separately processed circuitries 33 and 37, where the mid-tone gain m is applied to

each of the separate channel individually) (see Fig. 2, Col. 5, Lines 10-40) that is

inversely proportional to the contribution of said separate color channel signal to the

total luminance of the color matrix display (i.e. the mid-tone modifier is inverse

proportional to the overall brightness since the brighter the color components is on color

space the Euclidian distance is in inverse relationship with its mid-tone) (see Col. 5,

Lines 20-35).

.

As to claim 11, Gindele teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the step

of subdividing include subdividing a number 3 (i.e. N=3 for the three channels RGB) of

different color channel signal, and

the step of applying a gain factor includes applying a separate gain factor, to one

of the signal components for each color channel signal, that is about equal to the value

of 1/3 multiplied by the reciprocal contribution of the color channel signal to the total

luminance of the color matrix display (i.e. the mid-tone modifier for each of the channel

R, G, B are inverse proportional to the overall brightness since the brighter the color

components is on color space the Euclidian distance is in inverse relationship with its

mid-tone and since the mid-tone factor is a part of the three color combined brightness

total, the gain is about 1/3 of the total value of the entire image signal) (see Col. 5, Lines

20-35).

3.   Claims 13-16 are rejected 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Gindele et al

in view of Prentice as applied to claims 1 and 12, and further in view of Hunter et al. (US

Patent: 7,071,978).

As to claims 13 and 15, Gindele teaches the method and device of claim 1 and

12, but does not explicitly teaches applying a gain factor includes applying a gain factor

that removes a visible aliasing term from the incident color channel signal, however

Gindele does teach the possibility of texture amplifier being modified in manner by those

skilled in the art may desire.

Hunter teaches wherein applying a gain factor includes applying a gain factor

that removes a visible aliasing term from the incident color channel signal (i.e. Hunter

teaches the usage of the gain application method will remove color aliasing in the image) (see Hunter Col. 3, Lines 33-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the aliasing removal technique of Hunter in addition to the texture modifying circuitry of Gindele in order to further enhance the image processing capability of Gindele with anti-aliasing capabilities (see Hunter Col. 3, Lines 30-45).

As to claims 14 and 16, Hunter teaches wherein applying a gain factor includes applying a gain factor that sets constants of a visible aliasing term for the incident color channel signal to zero to remove a visible aliasing term from the incident color channel signal (i.e. Hunter teaches the usage of the gain application method will remove color aliasing in the image) (see Hunter, Col. 3, Lines 33-40).

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed 11/04/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant in pages 6-8 of the response with respect to claims 1-12 argues that the prior arts rejection are not valid because "there is not acceptable rationale for combining Gindele with Prentice to describe all of the limitations of the claims in the present application."

The examiner disagrees with this position due to the teaching of Prentice which specifically shows a drawing in figure 5 which shows a computer based implementation of the graphics processing system which is compatible with the system of Gindele which shows a similar computer based graphics processing system in the drawings of figure 1 where the display system is implemented in a personal computer setting. Also Prentice specifically teaches "Images may also be displayed on the display 114 via a personal computer card ... which contains digitized images electronically embodied in the card 130" and "It is suitable also for projecting mages one the screen using digital projectors." (see Prentice Fig. 1, [0031-0032]) Prentice clearly shows that the graphics processing system can be implemented in a general electronic display system which means that one of ordinary skill in the art when viewing the art of Prentice would be able to implement such system in the display environment of Gindele to further improve the display images to improve the display quality of the overall system. (see Prentice [0033-0035]). Therefore, the combination of the prior arts Gindele and Prentice read on the claimed limitations of claims 1-12.

As to applicant's argument with respect to claims 13-16, see response to claims 1-12.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to CALVIN C. MA whose telephone number is (571)270-

1713. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Quan-Zhen Wang can be reached on 571-272-3114. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Calvin Ma
January 6, 2011

/Quan-Zhen Wang/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629